DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 717 EA 032 311

AUTHOR	Beam, Margaret; Faddis, Bonnie
TITLE	The Implementation of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program: The Focus and Progress of Schools' Work in Seven Midwest States.
INSTITUTION	North Central Regional Educational Lab., Naperville, IL.; RMC Research Corp., Portland, OR.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2001-02-00
NOTE	40p.; For related document, see ED 472 637.
CONTRACT	ED-01-CO-0011
AVAILABLE FROM	North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200, Naperville, IL 60563. Tel: 630-649-6500; Tel: 800-356-2735 (Toll Free); Fax: 630-649-6700; e-mail: info@ncrel.org; Web site: http://www.ncrel.org. For full text: http://www.ncrel.org/csri/respub/demprog7/demprog7.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Strategies; Development; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Improvement; School Statistics; School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program; Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This report describes findings from the Comprehensive School Reform Implementation survey conducted in spring 2000. The purpose of the survey was to determine the extent to which each area of comprehensive school reform was a focus of reform efforts across seven Midwestern states and the extent to which principals and teachers believed they had made progress in each area. In addition, the survey prompted principals and teachers to report on the successes and challenges of comprehensive school reform and changes or improvements in teaching as a result of reform efforts. The principal or at least one teacher from 221 of the 361 targeted schools completed the survey. This report summarizes their responses. The survey findings reveal the following areas were the focus of reform: (1) developing a comprehensive reform plan; (2) obtaining staff support; (3) establishing measurable goals; (4) using effective research-based strategies for improving curriculum and instruction; and (5) providing professional development. Additionally, the following areas were most often identified for future efforts: using research-based strategies to improve integration of technology and instruction, and school organization and management; involving parents in comprehensive school reform; and using additional technical assistance from external sources. (Contains 15 exhibits.) (WFA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

EA EATR
0075

ED 473 717

The Implementation of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program

The Focus and Progress of Schools' Work in Seven Midwest States

NCREL
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
"Applying Research and Technology to Learning"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EA 032 311

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Implementation of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program:

The Focus and Progress of Schools' Work in Seven Midwest States

February 2001

Prepared by

Margaret Beam
Bonnie Faddis

RMC Research Corporation

NCREL
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
"Applying Research and Technology to Learning"

1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200
Naperville, Illinois 60563
(800) 356-2735 (630) 649-6500
www.ncrel.org

Copyright © 2001 by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. All rights reserved.

This work was produced in whole or in part with funds from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education, under contract number ED-01-CO-0011. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of OERI or the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

Contents

Exhibits i

Introduction 1

- Response Rates by State 2
- Sample Characteristics 4

Areas of Comprehensive School Reform Focus 7

Progress Achieving Reform Goals 11

Comparison of Principal and Teacher Ratings 15

Cross-Group Comparisons 21

- Cross-Group Comparisons of Progress 23

Reported Outcomes of Comprehensive School Reform 25

- Comprehensive School Reform Successes 25
- Challenges of Comprehensive School Reform 27
- Changes or Improvements in Teaching 29

Summary of Survey Findings 31

References 35

Appendix 37

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 CSR Implementation Survey Response Rate by State 3

Exhibit 2 CSR Implementation Survey Response Rate by Grade Level, Geographic Locale, and Title I Status 4

Exhibit 3 Number of Respondent Schools by Grade Level, Geographic Locale, and Title I Status 5

Exhibit 4 Principal and Teacher Report of Status of Reform Component Foci 7

Exhibit 5 Principal and Teacher Report of Reform Component Focus Level 9

Exhibit 6 Principal and Teacher Report of Schools' Reform Component Goal Achievement 11

Exhibit 7 Comparison of Principal and Teacher Ratings of Schools' Progress on Reform Components 13

Exhibit 8 Alignment of Principal and Teacher Ratings of Foci Levels on Reform Components 16

Exhibit 9 Alignment of Principal and Teacher Ratings of Progress on Reform Components 18

Exhibit 10 Comparison of Principals' Mean Ratings of Reform Component Focus Across Geographic Locale 21

Exhibit 11 Principal Report of Most Important Successes of Comprehensive School Reform 26

Exhibit 12 Teacher Report of Most Important Successes of Comprehensive School Reform 27

Exhibit 13 Principal Report of Most Significant Challenges of Comprehensive School Reform 28

Exhibit 14 Teacher Report of Most Significant Challenges of Comprehensive School Reform 28

Exhibit 15 Changes or Improvements in Teaching Reported by Teachers 29

Introduction

This report describes findings from the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) Implementation Survey that was conducted by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) in spring 2000. This survey was part of a larger study of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Program undertaken by NCREL and RMC Research Corporation during 2000 (see Faddis et al., 2000). NCREL developed the survey as a means of assessing the extent to which schools receiving CSRD funding had focused on each of the nine comprehensive school reform program components (comprehensive reform design, support within the school, measurable goals and benchmarks for student performance, parental and community involvement, effective research-based methods and strategies, professional development, external technical support and assistance, coordination with the school's other reform efforts, and evaluation strategies) and two additional components (support from the district office, and coordination of financial resources). NCREL also was interested in examining the progress that schools had made in implementing these components as part of their reform efforts.

NCREL mailed principal surveys to 361 schools in seven states in the North Central region of the United States. In addition, NCREL asked each of the 361 principals to distribute the teacher survey to two teachers engaged in the comprehensive school reform program at his or her school. The first part of the survey asked the principals and teachers to rate whether each reform component was a past, present (secondary or primary), or future focus. Respondents were then asked to rate the level of progress achieved for each area of focus. Respondents rated their progress as "goals achieved" or indicated their degree of progress on a scale from 1 (*no progress made*) to 4 (*significant progress made*). The second part of the survey asked principals and teachers one of three open-ended questions regarding important successes, significant challenges, or changes or improvements in teaching. The evaluators selected groups of schools to respond to each question. Copies of the principal and teacher surveys are in the Appendix.

This report summarizes the principal and teacher survey responses. The first section reports the survey response rates of principals and teachers across the seven states. The second section provides additional sample characteristics of the schools that responded to the surveys.

Following these general descriptive data are the results of analyses of the principal and teacher survey data at the aggregate and school levels. In addition to mailing surveys to the 361 schools, the evaluators obtained school information from the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's (SEDL) national database of schools receiving CSRD grants. The SEDL database provided complete data on geographic locale (urban, suburban, or rural), grade level (elementary, middle, high school, or combined), and Title I status (schoolwide, targeted assistance, yes [unspecified type], or no Title I) for 93 percent of the sample schools. The final component of the quantitative data analysis involved cross-group comparisons—that is, comparison of school differences across geographic locale, grade level, and Title I status. Responses to the open-ended survey questions are discussed in the final section of this report.

Response Rates by State

Of the 361 schools that received surveys, the principal or at least one teacher from 221 schools (61 percent) completed and returned a survey. Exhibit 1 shows the principal and teacher survey response rates for each of the seven states. The principal return rate across the seven states was 58 percent, and the teacher return rate across all states was 54 percent. Indiana produced the highest principal and teacher return rates with 89 percent of schools returning principal surveys and 83 percent of schools returning at least one teacher survey. Approximately three-fourths of the targeted schools in Wisconsin also returned principal and teacher surveys. Illinois produced the lowest rate of the seven states with 47 percent of the targeted schools returning principal surveys, and 35 percent of the targeted schools returning teacher surveys.

Exhibit 1
CSR Implementation Survey Response Rate by State

State	Survey Type	No. Schools Targeted	No. Schools Responding	Response Rate
IL	P	109	51	47%
	T	109	38	35%
IN	P	18	16	89%
	T	18	15	83%
IA	P	16	11	69%
	T	16	10	63%
MI	P	73	44	60%
	T	73	45	62%
MN	P	23	15	65%
	T	23	17	74%
OH	P	88	46	52%
	T	88	44	50%
WI	P	34	26	76%
	T	34	25	74%
Total	P	361	209	58%
	T	361	194	54%

Note. P = principal, T = teacher.

Exhibit 2 shows the school response rates by grade level, geographic locale, and Title I status. Elementary schools had a higher response rate than middle or high schools; suburban and rural schools had a higher response rate than urban schools; and targeted assistance and unspecified Title I program types had a higher response rate than schoolwide Title I or non-Title I schools.

Exhibit 2
CSR Implementation Survey Response Rate by Grade Level, Geographic Locale, and Title I Status

Characteristic	Mailed	Returned	Percent
Grade level			
Elementary	236	149	63%
Middle	52	28	54%
High	55	28	51%
Combined	7	7	100%
Geographic locale			
Urban	226	126	56%
Suburban	66	48	73%
Rural	53	37	70%
Title I status			
Schoolwide	206	120	58%
Targeted assistance	49	35	71%
Yes (unspecified)	43	31	72%
No	51	26	51%

Sample Characteristics

Sixty-nine percent of the responding schools (153 of 221) returned completed surveys from the principal and two teachers. Thirteen percent of the responding schools returned surveys from the principal and one teacher, and 12 percent returned surveys from the principal only. The remaining 6 percent of responding schools returned no principal surveys but returned a survey from at least one teacher. Schools did not differ on dimensions of geographic locale, grade level, or Title I status according to whether one, two, or three individuals returned the survey.

To assess the overall representativeness of the returned survey sample, the evaluators compared the schools that returned at least one survey to schools that did not return any surveys on the following dimensions: geographic locale, grade level, and Title I status. A Chi-square test revealed that urban schools were less represented in the returnee sample (60 percent) than in the nonreturnee sample (75 percent), χ^2 (2, n = 345) = 8.17, p = .05. Tests also revealed that elementary schools were slightly more represented in the returnee sample (70 percent) than in the

nonreturnee sample (63 percent), χ^2 (3, n = 350) = 8.34, $p < .05$. Returnee schools were equivalent to the nonreturnee schools on Title I status.

The SEDL database reported complete data for 203 of the 221 schools that returned at least one CSR Implementation Survey. Exhibit 3 shows the number and percentage of respondent schools at each grade level by geographic locale and Title I status.

Exhibit 3
Number of Respondent Schools by Grade Level, Geographic Locale, and Title I Status

Characteristic	Elementary (n = 143)	Middle (n = 27)	High (n = 26)	Combined (n = 7)
Geographic locale				
Urban	87 (61%)	13 (48%)	19 (73%)	3 (43%)
Suburban	34 (24%)	8 (30%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)
Rural	22 (15%)	6 (22%)	4 (15%)	4 (57%)
Title I status				
Schoolwide	94 (66%)	11 (41%)	10 (38%)	1 (14%)
Targeted assistance	19 (13%)	9 (33%)	1 (4%)	3 (43%)
Yes (unspecified)	22 (15%)	2 (7%)	4 (15%)	1 (14%)
No	8 (6%)	5 (19%)	11 (42%)	2 (29%)

Of the 144 elementary schools that returned surveys, the majority (61 percent) were located in urban areas, 24 percent were located in suburban areas, and 15 percent were located in rural regions. This pattern is similar for middle schools and high schools. The percentages of schools returning surveys in urban, suburban, and rural regions were 48 percent, 30 percent, and 22 percent, respectively, for middle schools (n = 27), and 73 percent, 12 percent, and 15 percent for high schools (n = 28). Three of the seven combined schools that returned surveys were in urban areas, and the remaining four were in rural areas.

The majority (66 percent) of the elementary schools that returned surveys were Title I schoolwide status. Middle and high schools also were more likely to be Title I schoolwide than targeted-assistance Title I. Elementary schools and middle schools were more likely than high schools to be receiving any type of Title I funding.

Areas of Comprehensive School Reform Focus

To assess schools' implementation status for each of the reform components, the survey asked principals and teachers to report whether each component was a past, present, or future focus. Exhibit 4 depicts the percentage of all principals and all teachers who reported each reform component as a past, present, or future focus.

Exhibit 4
Principal and Teacher Report of Status of Reform Component Foci

	Principals (n = 209)			Teachers (n = 355)		
Reform Component	**Past**	**Present**	**Future**	**Past**	**Present**	**Future**
Developing a comprehensive school reform plan covering nine components that are appropriately aligned	0%	99%	1%	0%	98%	1%
Obtaining support from entire staff in implementing reform models	3%	94%	3%	3%	94%	3%
Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement that are aligned with state standards	3%	95%	2%	3%	94%	3%
Involving parents in comprehensive school reform	1%	87%	13%	0%	83%	17%
Using effective, research-based strategies for:						
Improving curriculum	1%	95%	4%	1%	94%	5%
Improving instructional strategies	0%	99%	1%	0%	98%	2%
Improving integration of technology and instruction	1%	80%	19%	1%	78%	20%
Improving school organization or management	4%	85%	11%	3%	83%	14%
Improving assessment of student progress	1%	94%	5%	1%	93%	7%
Providing professional development for teachers to help implement reform strategies	0%	98%	2%	0%	97%	3%
Obtaining additional technical assistance from external sources	1%	83%	16%	1%	81%	18%
Using data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of comprehensive school reform efforts	1%	91%	8%	1%	90%	10%
Obtaining support from district office to implement reform strategies	3%	86%	11%	2%	85%	13%

(exhibit continues)

Reform Component	Principals (n = 209) Past	Present	Future	Teachers (n = 355) Past	Present	Future
Ensuring that the CSRD-funded reform effort is coordinated with the school's other reform efforts	2%	92%	6%	1%	91%	8%
Coordinating financial resources for comprehensive school reform with other resources to support reform	1%	93%	6%	1%	91%	8%

In general, the majority of principals and teachers responded similarly that each of the identified reform components was a present focus of their school reform (between 90 percent and 100 percent of the teachers and principals reported 10 of the 15 components to be a present focus). Areas that survey respondents most often identified as future foci, however, were the use of research-based strategies to improve the integration of technology and instruction (19 percent of the principals and 20 percent of the teachers identified this component as a future focus), the use of research-based strategies to improve school organization or management (identified by 11 percent of the principals and 14 percent of the teachers), the involvement of parents in comprehensive school reform (identified by 13 percent of the principals and 17 percent of the teachers), obtaining support from the district office to implement reform strategies (identified by 11 percent of the principals and 13 percent of the teachers), and the use of additional technical assistance from external sources (identified by 16 percent of the principals and 18 percent of the teachers as a future focus).

As reflected by the high numbers of principals and teachers who identified each reform component as a present focus, the average number of present foci reported by principals and teachers also was high. The average number of present foci reported by principals was 13.9 out of a possible 15, and the average number of present foci reported by teachers was 13.3. The survey also asked respondents to report whether present foci were primary or secondary. Broken down by primary and secondary foci, the average numbers of primary foci reported by principals and teachers were 10.4 and 9.5, respectively. The average numbers of secondary foci reported by principals and teachers were 3.6 and 3.8, respectively.

Exhibit 5 categorizes each present focus as a primary or secondary focus and shows the percentage of the principals and teachers who identified each of the reform components to be

either a primary or secondary focus at their school. It also is noteworthy that data presented in Exhibit 5 generally support the data presented in Exhibit 4—that is, the reform components that principals and teachers most identified as secondary foci in Exhibit 5 were the same components they identified as *future* foci in Exhibit 4.

Exhibit 5
Principal and Teacher Report of Reform Component Focus Level

	Primary Focus		Secondary Focus	
Reform Component	**Principal**	**Teacher**	**Principal**	**Teacher**
Developing a comprehensive school reform plan covering nine components that are appropriately aligned	96%	91%	4%	9%
Obtaining support from entire staff in implementing reform models	91%	84%	9%	16%
Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement that are aligned with state standards	86%	80%	14%	20%
Involving parents in comprehensive school reform	57%	57%	43%	43%
Using effective, research-based strategies for:				
Improving curriculum	85%	84%	16%	16%
Improving instructional strategies	90%	86%	10%	14%
Improving integration of technology and instruction	46%	48%	54%	52%
Improving school organization or management	56%	52%	44%	48%
Improving assessment of student progress	75%	76%	25%	24%
Providing professional development for teachers to help implement reform strategies	93%	84%	7%	16%
Obtaining additional technical assistance from external sources	55%	58%	45%	42%
Using data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of comprehensive school reform efforts	72%	66%	28%	34%
Obtaining support from district office to implement reform strategies	53%	52%	47%	48%
Ensuring that the CSRD-funded reform effort is coordinated with the school's other reform efforts	82%	71%	18%	39%
Coordinating financial resources for comprehensive school reform with other resources to support reform	70%	67%	30%	33%

Note. Principal subsample sizes per item ranged from 167 to 207. Teacher subsample sizes per item ranged from 277 to 347.

The principal and teacher reports were generally similar, with the exception that principals (82 percent) were more likely than teachers (71 percent) to report that coordinating comprehensive school reform with other reform efforts was a primary, as opposed to a secondary, goal. Overall, more than 80 percent of the principals and teachers reported these six areas to be the primary foci at their schools:

- Developing a comprehensive reform plan.
- Obtaining staff support.
- Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks.
- Using effective, research-based strategies for improving curriculum.
- Using effective, research-based strategies for improving instruction.
- Providing professional development.

Progress Achieving Reform Goals

To assess schools' progress in achieving the goals of each of the reform components, the survey asked principals and teachers to rate the progress they had made toward goal achievement. The evaluators subsequently created two dimensions of goal achievement: goal was achieved (*yes* or *no*); and, if the goal was not achieved, the degree of progress made toward it (1 = *no progress made*, 4 = *significant progress made*). Exhibit 6 shows the percentage of principals and teachers in the sample who reported that their school already had achieved the goals that they intended to accomplish.

Exhibit 6
Principal and Teacher Report of Schools' Reform Component Goal Achievement

Reform Component	Principals	Teachers
Developing a comprehensive school reform plan covering nine components that are appropriately aligned	10%	10%
Obtaining support from entire staff in implementing reform models	24%	16%
Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement that are aligned with state standards	19%	21%
Involving parents in comprehensive school reform	8%	6%
Using effective, research-based strategies for:		
Improving curriculum	8%	11%
Improving instructional strategies	8%	10%
Improving integration of technology and instruction	7%	9%
Improving school organization or management	11%	7%
Improving assessment of student progress	10%	10%
Providing professional development for teachers to help implement reform strategies	26%	23%
Obtaining additional technical assistance from external sources	17%	14%
Using data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of comprehensive school reform efforts	10%	15%
Obtaining support from district office to implement reform strategies	19%	16%
Ensuring that the CSRD-funded reform effort is coordinated with the school's other reform efforts	33%	22%
Coordinating financial resources for comprehensive school reform with other resources to support reform	33%	24%

Note. Principal *n*s per item ranged from 194 to 209. Teacher *n*s per item ranged from 324 to 348.

For each of the 15 reform components, less than a third of the respondents reported that their school had achieved its goals. Percentages ranged from 7 percent to 33 percent of principals and 6 percent to 24 percent of teachers. The reform areas for which at least 20 percent of the principals and 20 percent of the teachers reported that the schools had achieved their goals were professional development, the coordination of comprehensive school reform with the school's other reform efforts, and the coordination of financial resources to support comprehensive school reform.

With the exception of three reform components, the proportions of principals and teachers reporting that the schools had achieved their goals were similar. Principals were more likely than the teachers to report goal achievement in obtaining staff support (24 percent versus 16 percent), ensuring the coordination of comprehensive school reform efforts with other reform efforts at the school (33 percent versus 22 percent), and the coordination of financial resources for comprehensive school reform with other resources (33 percent versus 24 percent).

Principals and teachers rated their schools' progress toward the unmet goals of each reform component on a four-point scale (1 = *no progress,* 2 = *a little progress,* 3 = *some progress,* and 4 = *significant progress).* Exhibit 7 reports the mean ratings and standard deviations for the principals' and teachers' ratings of progress for each reform component.

Exhibit 7
Comparison of Principal and Teacher Ratings of Schools' Progress on Reform Components

Reform Component	Principals		Teachers		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
Developing a comprehensive school reform plan covering nine components that are appropriately aligned	3.77	0.48	3.67	0.55	2.07*
Obtaining support from entire staff in implementing reform models	3.78	0.46	3.47	0.66	5.94***
Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement that are aligned with state standards	3.56	0.58	3.50	0.65	0.96
Involving parents in comprehensive school reform	3.06	0.76	2.91	0.91	2.05*
Using effective, research-based strategies for:					
Improving curriculum	3.57	0.68	3.45	0.78	1.72
Improving instructional strategies	3.65	0.54	3.49	0.65	2.96**
Improving integration of technology and instruction	3.00	0.84	2.91	0.91	1.14
Improving school organization or management	3.43	0.74	3.19	0.87	3.32***
Improving assessment of student progress	3.40	0.66	3.34	0.80	1.03
Providing professional development for teachers to help implement reform strategies	3.75	0.51	3.57	0.66	3.07**
Obtaining additional technical assistance from external sources	3.26	0.86	3.11	0.96	1.66
Using data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of comprehensive school reform efforts	3.41	0.68	3.19	0.84	2.95**
Obtaining support from district office to implement reform strategies	3.23	0.88	2.98	0.94	2.80**
Ensuring that the CSRD-funded reform effort is coordinated with the school's other reform efforts	3.63	0.63	3.35	0.85	3.74***
Coordinating financial resources for comprehensive school reform with other resources to support reform	3.67	0.56	3.37	0.85	4.15***

Note. Principal *n*s per item ranged from 135 to 188. Teacher *n*s per item ranged from 249 to 322.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

In general, the principals and teachers reported moderately high ratings of the schools' progress on the reform components. (Both sources' ratings were between 3 and 4 on the four-point scale for most response categories.) The three areas in which schools reportedly made the greatest progress were developing a comprehensive reform plan with nine aligned components (*M*s = 3.77 and 3.67 for principals and teachers, respectively), attaining staff support (*M*s = 3.78

and 3.47 for principals and teachers, respectively), and providing professional development activities (*M*s = 3.75 and 3.57 for principals and teachers, respectively). Conversely, the three areas in which principals and teachers reported making the least progress were involving parents (*M*s = 3.06 and 2.91 for principals and teachers, respectively), improving the integration of technology and instruction (*M*s = 3.00 and 2.91 for principals and teachers, respectively), and obtaining support from the district office to implement reform strategies (*M*s = 3.23 and 2.98 for principals and teachers, respectively). Again, principals and teachers most often reported these reform components as future foci.

Overall, principals' ratings of progress were significantly higher than teachers' ratings on 10 of the 15 reform components. The most significant discrepancies existed for the following four components: attaining staff support (*M* difference = .31); coordinating comprehensive school reform resources with other financial resources to support reform (*M* difference = .30); coordinating comprehensive school reform with other reform efforts (*M* difference = .28); and using effective, research-based strategies to improve school organization or management (*M* difference = .24).

Comparison of Principal and Teacher Ratings

This section presents the survey results at the school level, comparing the within-school principal and teacher reports on their school's degree of focus on and progress toward the goals associated with each reform component. These comparisons include only those respondents who identified the component as a present focus. For the comparison of the principals' and teachers' responses, the evaluators grouped schools that returned only one teacher survey with schools that returned two teacher surveys. In other words, perfect principal-teacher agreement might reflect perfect agreement between a single teacher and the principal or between two teachers and the principal.

Exhibit 8 shows that the four reform components for which principals and teachers were most likely to reach complete agreement regarding their school's degree of focus were:

- Developing a comprehensive reform plan.
- Using effective, research-based strategies to improve instructional strategies.
- Providing professional development.
- Obtaining staff support.

The three reform components for which the teachers and principals in at least 25 percent of the responding schools revealed complete disagreement were:

- Involving parents
- Coordinating comprehensive school reform resources with other resources
- Obtaining technical assistance from external sources.

Exhibit 9 shows that principals' and teachers' ratings of progress toward the reform component goals were generally within one point of each other, indicating that there was significant agreement between the two sources.

Exhibit 8
Alignment of Principal and Teacher Ratings of Foci Levels on Reform Components

Reform Component	Principal Reported Primary Focus			Principal Reported Secondary Focus		
	Teacher(s) Reported Primary Focus	Teacher 1 Reported Primary Focus, Teacher 2 Reported Secondary Focus	Teacher(s) Reported Secondary Focus	Teacher(s) Reported Primary Focus	Teacher 1 Reported Primary Focus, Teacher 2 Reported Secondary Focus	Teacher(s) Reported Secondary Focus
Developing a comprehensive school reform plan covering nine components that are appropriately aligned (n = 178)	84%	11%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Obtaining support from entire staff in implementing reform models (n = 165)	73%	14%	4%	2%	4%	3%
Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement that are aligned with state standards (n = 169)	63%	16%	4%	8%	4%	5%
Involving parents in comprehensive school reform (n = 155)	31%	16%	13%	12%	11%	17%
Using effective, research-based strategies for:						
Improving curriculum (n = 171)	67%	14%	5%	10%	1%	3%
Improving instructional strategies (n = 181)	75%	10%	5%	5%	2%	3%
Improving integration of technology and instruction (n = 131)	29%	13%	8%	15%	5%	31%
Improving school organization or management (n = 148)	31%	14%	11%	11%	10%	23%
Improving assessment of student progress (n = 172)	56%	13%	7%	10%	4%	9%

(exhibit continues)

Exhibit 8 (continued)

Reform Component	Principal Reported Primary Focus			Principal Reported Secondary Focus		
	Teacher(s) Reported Primary Focus	Teacher 1 Reported Primary Focus, Teacher 2 Reported Secondary Focus	Teacher(s) Reported Secondary Focus	Teacher(s) Reported Primary Focus	Teacher 1 Reported Primary Focus, Teacher 2 Reported Secondary Focus	Teacher(s) Reported Secondary Focus
Providing professional development for teachers to help implement reform strategies (n = 179)	73%	16%	4%	2%	3%	3%
Obtaining additional technical assistance from external sources (n = 138)	35%	12%	12%	14%	11%	17%
Using data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of comprehensive school reform efforts (n = 159)	45%	18%	11%	11%	6%	9%
Obtaining support from district office to implement reform strategies (n = 145)	28%	14%	13%	10%	12%	23%
Ensuring that the CSRD-funded reform effort is coordinated with the school's other reform efforts (n = 164)	49%	20%	12%	12%	4%	4%
Coordinating financial resources for comprehensive school reform with other resources to support reform (n = 165)	43%	17%	10%	15%	5%	9%

Note. The values represent the percentage of schools.
Note. The values include only schools in which the reform component was a present focus.

Exhibit 9
Alignment of Principal and Teacher Ratings of Progress on Reform Components

Reform Component	All Sources in Perfect Agreement	Combined Teachers' Rating Was: 0.5 Points off Principal's Rating	1 Point off Principal's Rating	1.5 Points off Principal's Rating	2 Points off Principal's Rating	2.5 Points off Principal's Rating	3 Points off Principal's Rating
Developing a comprehensive reform plan covering nine components that are appropriately aligned (n = 157)	59%	21%	17%	1%	3%	0%	0%
Obtaining support from entire staff in implementing reform models (n = 128)	45%	25%	24%	3%	3%	0%	0%
Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement that are aligned with state standards (n = 130)	48%	23%	25%	1%	3%	1%	0%
Involving parents in comprehensive school reform (n = 160)	32%	23%	36%	4%	4%	0%	1%
Using effective, research-based strategies for:							
Improving curriculum (n = 155)	50%	16%	26%	4%	4%	2%	1%
Improving instructional strategies (n = 156)	54%	21%	20%	2%	3%	0%	0%
Improving integration of technology and instruction (n = 150)	38%	25%	23%	4%	6%	0%	2%
Improving school organization or management (n = 143)	38%	19%	33%	6%	2%	1%	1%
Improving assessment of student progress (n = 153)	42%	22%	29%	6%	2%	0%	0%

(exhibit continues)

Exhibit 9 (continued)

Reform Component	All Sources in Perfect Agreement	Combined Teachers' Rating Was: 0.5 Points Off Principal's Rating	1 Point Off Principal's Rating	1.5 Points Off Principal's Rating	2 Points Off Principal's Rating	2.5 Points Off Principal's Rating	3 Points Off Principal's Rating
Providing professional development for teachers to help implement reform strategies (n = 123)	51%	18%	25%	1%	6%	0%	0%
Obtaining additional technical assistance from external sources (n = 130)	34%	19%	27%	5%	10%	2%	3%
Using data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of comprehensive school reform efforts (n = 139)	40%	26%	23%	6%	3%	0%	2%
Obtaining support from district office to implement reform strategies (n = 129)	36%	14%	36%	4%	6%	2%	2%
Ensuring that the CSRD-funded reform effort is coordinated with the school's other reform efforts (n = 101)	42%	19%	29%	3%	7%	0%	1%
Coordinating financial resources for comprehensive school reform with other resources to support reform (n = 98)	44%	18%	22%	5%	9%	0%	1%

Note. The values represent the percentage of schools. 1 = *no progress*, 4 = *significant progress*.
Note. The values include only schools in which the reform component goal had not yet been achieved.

Cross-Group Comparisons

To determine whether response patterns existed across schools by geographic locale, grade level, or Title I status, the evaluators ran cross-group comparisons for each dimension with respect to principals' responses as well as teachers' responses. Specifically, the evaluators conducted one-way ANOVAs on present foci only. (Cell sizes would be too small to detect differences for either past or future foci.) Exhibit 10 compares the principals' mean ratings of their school's level of focus on each reform component across geographic locale.

Exhibit 10
Comparison of Principals' Mean Ratings of Reform Component Focus Across Geographic Locale

Reform Component	Urban (n = 119)	Suburban (n = 44)	Rural (n = 36)	F
Developing a comprehensive school reform plan covering nine components that are appropriately aligned	0.99	0.91	0.92	4.07*
Obtaining support from entire staff in implementing reform models	0.94	0.93	0.85	1.34
Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement that are aligned with state standards	0.85	0.90	0.83	0.39
Involving parents in comprehensive school reform	0.64	0.38	0.56	4.12 *
Using effective, research-based strategies for:				
Improving curriculum	0.88	0.77	0.88	1.64
Improving instructional strategies	0.96	0.89	0.69	11.61***
Improving integration of technology and instruction	0.49	0.32	0.61	2.54
Improving school organization or management	0.63	0.54	0.42	2.37
Improving assessment of student progress	0.81	0.74	0.56	4.42*
Providing professional development for teachers to help implement reform strategies	0.95	0.95	0.86	1.92
Obtaining additional technical assistance from external sources	0.59	0.36	0.57	2.90

(exhibit continues)

Reform Component	Urban (n = 119)	Suburban (n = 44)	Rural (n = 36)	F
Using data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of comprehensive school reform efforts	0.77	0.62	0.61	2.88
Obtaining support from district office to implement reform strategies	0.56	0.53	0.44	0.61
Ensuring that the CSRD-funded reform effort is coordinated with the school's other reform efforts	0.85	0.83	0.67	2.99
Coordinating financial resources for comprehensive school reform with other resources to support reform	0.82	0.57	0.53	9.03***

Note. 0 = secondary, 1 = primary.
*$p < .05$. ***$p < .001$.

The following differences were evident across the urban, suburban, and rural schools:

- Principals from urban schools were more likely than principals from suburban or rural schools to report the development of a comprehensive reform plan as a primary, as opposed to a secondary, focus, $F(2,197) = 4.07, p < .05$.
- Principals from urban schools were more likely than principals from suburban or rural schools to report the coordination of financial resources as a primary, as opposed to a secondary, focus, $F(2,189) = 9.03, p < .001$.
- Principals from suburban schools were more likely than principals from urban or rural schools to report parent involvement as a secondary, as opposed to a primary, focus, $F(2,185) = 4.12, p < .05$.
- Principals from urban and suburban schools were more likely than principals from rural schools to report the use of effective, research-based strategies to improve instructional strategies as a primary, as opposed to a secondary, focus, $F(2,197) = 11.61, p < .001$.
- Principals from rural schools were more likely than principals from urban or suburban schools to report the use of effective, research-based strategies to improve assessment of student progress as a secondary, as opposed to a primary, focus, $F(2,189) = 4.42, p < .05$.

Comparisons of principals' mean ratings of their school's degree of focus on each reform component across grade levels revealed only one difference:

- Principals from elementary schools were more likely than principals from other schools to report the use of effective, research-based strategies to improve the integration of technology into the classroom as a secondary focus, $F(3,166) = 3.27$, $p < .05$.

Comparisons of principals' mean ratings of their school's degree of focus on each reform component across Title I status revealed two differences:

- Principals from schools receiving Title I schoolwide funding and schools receiving no Title I funding were more likely than principals from schools receiving targeted-assistance Title I funding to report the use of effective, research-based strategies to improve school organization as a primary focus, $F(3,178) = 5.84$, $p < .001$.
- Principals from schools receiving Title I schoolwide funding were more likely than principals from schools receiving no Title I funding to report the coordination of financial resources to support reform as a primary focus, $F(3,189) = 4.90$, $p < .01$.

Comparisons of teachers' mean ratings of their school's degree of focus on each reform component across geographic locale, grade level, and Title I status revealed no differences.

Cross-Group Comparisons of Progress

Comparisons of principals' mean ratings of their school's progress toward the goals associated with each reform component across geographic locale, grade level, and Title I status revealed no significant differences. Similarly, comparisons of teachers' mean ratings of their school's progress toward the goals associated with each reform component across geographic locale and Title I status revealed no significant differences. The teachers' responses, however, differed across grade level for the parent involvement reform component. Specifically, teachers from elementary schools reported significantly less progress involving parents in school reform than did teachers from schools of other grade levels, $F(3,179) = 3.63$, $p < .01$.

Reported Outcomes of Comprehensive School Reform

Each principal and teacher survey included an open-ended question about one of the following comprehensive school reform topics: important successes, significant challenges, and changes or improvements in teaching.

Comprehensive School Reform Successes

Exhibits 11 and 12 summarize the responses of principals and teachers, respectively, to open-ended questions about the important successes of their comprehensive school reform efforts. A total of 80 principals and 111 teachers responded to these questions. The successes most frequently mentioned by both principals and teachers were professional development and training, new or improved teaching strategies, and staff involvement and commitment to common goals or philosophy. In addition, principals commonly mentioned improved test scores or achievement, improved parent involvement, and staff coordination of efforts to improve instruction (see Exhibit 11). Teachers frequently mentioned the use of data to reteach skills or individualize instruction, the implementation of new instructional programs, staff coordination of efforts to improve instruction, and student progress in targeted subject areas (see Exhibit 12).

Exhibit 11
Principal Report of Most Important Successes of Comprehensive School Reform

Area of Success	No. Principals Reporting	Percent
Staff involvement or commitment to common goals or philosophy	26	33%
Professional development or training	24	30%
New or improved teaching strategies	20	25%
Improved test scores or achievement	15	19%
Improved parent involvement	14	18%
Staff coordination of efforts to improve instruction	9	11%
Use of data to reteach skills or individualize instruction	6	8%
Improved assessment of student progress	6	8%
Improved school organization or leadership	6	8%
Improved school culture or climate	5	6%
Increased use of technology	5	6%
Implementation of new instructional programs	4	5%
Student progress in targeted subject areas	4	5%
Alignment of curriculum within or across grade levels	4	5%
Effective external support	4	5%

Note. Multiple responses were possible. $n = 80$.

Exhibit 12
Teacher Report of Most Important Successes of Comprehensive School Reform

Area of Success	No. Teachers Reporting	Percent
Professional development or training	32	29%
New or improved teaching strategies	23	21%
Staff involvement or commitment to common goals or philosophy	16	14%
Use of data to reteach skills or individualize instruction	12	11%
Implementation of new instructional programs	11	10%
Staff coordination of efforts to improve instruction	10	10%
Student progress in targeted subject areas	10	10%
Alignment of curriculum within or across grade levels	9	8%
Improved test scores	8	7%
Alignment of curriculum with state standards	7	6%
Improved student participation	7	6%
Money for materials and equipment needed to meet goals	6	5%
On-site instructional guide or coach	6	5%
Improved parent involvement	5	5%
Curriculum development	4	4%
Time for teachers to work together	4	4%
Helping students to meet goals	4	4%
Effective external support	4	4%

Note. Multiple responses were possible. $n = 111$.

Challenges of Comprehensive School Reform

A total of 51 principals and 83 teachers reported significant challenges to implementing comprehensive school reform efforts. Exhibits 13 and 14 summarize the most common challenges mentioned by the principals and teachers, respectively. The challenge most frequently identified by both principals and teachers was the extra time required to implement new strategies. Principals and teachers also cited the time needed for collaborating and planning with others and the difficulties involving parents as significant challenges to reform implementation. Principals reported the time required for professional development as an additional challenge. Challenges commonly identified by teachers included difficulty convincing staff to buy in to the

extra work required by reform, the reluctance of some staff to change, and implementation of all aspects of the reform plan.

Exhibit 13
Principal Report of Most Significant Challenges of Comprehensive School Reform

Challenge	No. Principals Reporting	Percent
Extra time required to implement new strategies	15	29
Time to collaborate and plan with others	10	20
Time for professional development	10	20
Involving parents	8	16
Measuring student progress	6	12
Getting staff to buy in to the extra work	5	10
Reluctance of some staff to change	5	10
Staff turnover, resulting in new staff who need training	5	10
Inadequate physical facilities	5	10

Note. Multiple responses were possible. $n = 51$.

Exhibit 14
Teacher Report of Most Significant Challenges of Comprehensive School Reform

Challenge	No. Teachers Reporting	Percent
Extra time required to implement new strategies	20	24%
Getting staff to buy in to the extra work	15	18%
Reluctance of some staff to change	9	11%
Involving parents	9	11%
Implementing all aspects of the plan or program	8	10%
Time to collaborate and plan with others	8	10%
Time for professional development	6	7%
Getting district support	6	7%
Staff turnover, resulting in new staff who need training	5	6%
Getting sufficient materials or software licenses	5	6%
Measuring student progress	4	5%

Note. Multiple responses were possible. $n = 83$.

Changes or Improvements in Teaching

A total of 110 teachers responded to open-ended questions regarding changes or improvements they had made in their teaching as a result of comprehensive school reform. Exhibit 15 summarizes the most frequently mentioned changes. Nearly a third of the respondents cited the use of new teaching strategies. Other commonly mentioned improvements were changes in teaching content prompted by a greater awareness of standards and benchmarks, adoption of a more student-centered approach, improved organization and instructional focus, and increased coordination and sharing among staff.

Exhibit 15
Changes or Improvements in Teaching Reported by Teachers

Improvement	No. Teachers Reporting	Percent
Use of new teaching strategies	35	32%
Increased awareness of standards and benchmarks and corresponding changes to lesson plans	11	10%
Adoption of a more student-centered approach	9	8%
Improved organization and instructional focus	8	7%
Increased coordination and sharing among staff	8	7%
Use of test data to track student progress	7	6%
Use of test data to identify instructional needs	6	5%
Increased coaching and encouragement among teachers	6	5%
Increased incorporation of real-world experiences	5	5%
Increased student responsibility for learning	5	5%
Greater awareness of student needs	5	5%
Use of test data to group students for instruction	4	4%
Use of more curriculum resources	4	4%
Increased integration of different subjects	4	4%

Note. Multiple responses were possible. $n = 110$.

Summary of Survey Findings

The purpose of the CSR Implementation Survey was to determine the extent to which each area of comprehensive school reform was a focus of reform efforts across the region and the extent to which principals and teachers believed they had made progress in each area. In addition, the survey prompted principals and teachers to report on the successes and challenges of comprehensive school reform and changes or improvements in teaching as a result of reform efforts.

The principal or at least one teacher from 221 (61 percent) of the 361 targeted schools completed the survey. In the majority of these schools (69 percent), the principal and two teachers returned surveys. Compared to the entire population of CSRD schools in the region, urban schools were underrepresented and elementary schools were overrepresented in the returnee sample.

Between 90 percent and 100 percent of the principals and teachers who responded to the survey reported that 10 of the 15 comprehensive school reform components were a current focus of their reform efforts. Six areas stood out as the primary foci of reform:

- Developing a comprehensive reform plan.
- Obtaining staff support.
- Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks.
- Using effective, research-based strategies for improving curriculum.
- Using effective, research-based strategies for improving instruction.
- Providing professional development.

The areas most often identified as future foci were:

- Using research-based strategies to improve integration of technology and instruction.
- Using research-based strategies to improve school organization and management.
- Involving parents in comprehensive school reform.
- Using additional technical assistance from external sources.

The evaluators compared principal reports with teacher reports within schools on degree of focus on and progress toward the goals associated with each reform component. Principals and

teachers were most likely to agree on their school's degree of focus on developing a comprehensive reform plan; using effective, research-based strategies to improve instructional strategies; providing professional development activities; and obtaining staff support. Principals and teachers were least likely to agree on the degree of focus on involving parents, coordinating comprehensive school reform resources with other resources, and obtaining technical assistance from external sources.

Principals and teachers were generally within one point of each other in their ratings of progress reaching reform goals, although principal ratings of progress were noticeably higher than teacher ratings on 10 of the 15 reform components. The largest discrepancies occurred for attaining staff support, coordinating financial resources, coordinating comprehensive school reform with other reform efforts, and using effective research-based strategies to improve school organization or management.

The evaluators also compared principal-response patterns across schools by geographic locale, grade level, and Title I status. For most reform components, no differences in the mean degree of focus were evident across these dimensions. Principals from urban schools, however, were more likely than other principals to report the development of a comprehensive reform plan and the coordination of financial resources as primary, as opposed to secondary, foci. Principals from suburban schools more often reported improving instructional strategies as a primary focus and involving parents as a secondary focus compared to other principals. Principals from rural schools were more likely to report improving assessment of student progress as a secondary rather than a primary focus. Elementary school principals tended to report improving the integration of technology as a secondary rather than a primary focus. Principals from schools receiving Title I schoolwide funding were more likely than other principals to report improving school organization and coordinating financial resources as primary foci. Comparisons of teachers' mean ratings across geographic locale, grade level, and Title I status revealed no differences.

Comparisons of principals' mean ratings of the schools' progress toward the goals associated with each reform component revealed no differences across geographic locale, grade level, or Title I status. Similarly, comparisons of teachers' mean ratings of progress showed no

differences except for the area of involving parents. Specifically, elementary school teachers reported less progress involving parents in school reform than did other teachers.

Principals and teachers reported similar successes and challenges implementing comprehensive school reform. The most frequently mentioned successes for both groups were professional development, new teaching strategies, and staff commitment to common goals. Principals and teachers both mentioned the extra time required to implement new strategies as the most significant challenge. The challenges of finding time to collaborate and plan with other staff, involving parents, and obtaining buy-in from staff who are reluctant to change also were mentioned frequently by both principals and teachers. Teachers who reported on the changes they had made in their teaching as a result of comprehensive school reform most often indicated using new teaching strategies, incorporating standards and benchmarks into their lesson planning, and using more student-centered learning approaches.

Overall, the CSR Implementation Survey findings reveal a high level of agreement among principals and teachers concerning the degree of focus of their reform efforts and the amount of progress they had made toward achieving their goals. Geographic locale, grade level, and Title I status do not appear to have played a significant role in the reform components that schools focused on or in the schools' goal attainment. School staff reported that the majority of the reform components were a primary, as opposed to a secondary, focus of their reform efforts. These findings are supported by the results from an in-depth study of 40 CSRD schools in the same geographic region (see Faddis et al., 2000). For most kinds of schools, comprehensive reform is a slow and difficult process. In spite of the challenges, comprehensive reform also is a very rewarding process for those schools whose staff have bought in to the process and are willing to give the time needed to make meaningful changes in instructional practices.

References

Faddis, B. J., Beam, M., Hahn, K. J., Willardson, M., Sipe, D., & Ahrens-Gray, P. (2000). *The implementation of the comprehensive school reform demonstration program: The work of 40 schools in seven midwest states.* Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Appendix

School ID _____

Comprehensive School Reform Implementation—[State]
Spring 2000 Principal Survey

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) is conducting a 7-state study of Comprehensive School Reform (**CSR**). The purpose of the study is to develop a regional summary of schools' progress in implementing their reform plans. We would appreciate your participation. Your responses will be confidential and will not be identified with your school or district. Survey respondents will receive a copy of the survey report in the summer of 2000.

Grade Range of School_____ Enrollment_____ Month/Year CSR Grant Awarded_____

CSR Reform Model(s) You Are Currently Using	Month/Year You Started Working With Model
1.	
2.	
3.	

In column A below, please circle a number to indicate the extent to which each area was a focus of your comprehensive school reform efforts this school year (1999–2000).

In column B, please rate the amount of progress you feel your school has made in each area of focus. *If the area was not a focus, leave column B blank.*

Reform Component	A Extent to Which This is a Focus of CSR Efforts in 1999–2000 3– A primary focus 2– A secondary focus 1– Not yet a focus 0– Past focus—goal previously addressed	B Rating of Progress in Areas of Major or Minor Focus 5–Goals achieved 4–Significant progress made 3–Some progress made 2–A little progress made 1–No progress made
1. Ensuring that our comprehensive reform plans cover curriculum, instruction, assessment, parent involvement, professional development, and school management, and that these elements are appropriately aligned.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
2. Obtaining support from the entire staff in implementing the reform models.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
3. Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement that are aligned with state standards.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
4. Involving parents in school reform planning, training, or implementation activities.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1

Reform Component	A **Extent to Which This is a Focus of CSR Efforts in 1999–2000** 3– A primary focus 2– A secondary focus 1– Not yet a focus 0– Past focus—goal previously addressed	B **Rating of Progress in Areas of Major or Minor Focus** 5–Goals achieved 4–Significant progress made 3–Some progress made 2–A little progress made 1–No progress made
5. Using effective, research-based methods and strategies for:		
a. Improving curriculum.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
b. Improving instructional strategies.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
c. Improving the integration of technology into instruction.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
d. Improving school organization or management.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
e. Improving the assessment of student progress.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
6. Providing professional development for teachers to help implement reform strategies.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
7. Obtaining additional technical assistance from external sources to implement CSR strategies.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
8. Using data to evaluate the implementation and outcomes of CSR efforts.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
9. Obtaining support from the district office to implement reform strategies.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
10. Ensuring that the CSR-funded reform effort is coordinated with our school's other reform efforts.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
11. Coordinating financial resources for CSR with other resources to support reform.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1

1. What have been the greatest successes in your CSR efforts to date?

Thank you for your assistance!
Please mail your completed survey to
Larry Friedman, NCREL, 1900 Spring Road, Oak Brook, IL 60521

Comprehensive School Reform Implementation—[State]
Spring 2000 Teacher Survey

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) is conducting a 7-state study of Comprehensive School Reform (**CSR**). The purpose of the study is to develop a regional summary of schools' progress in implementing their reform plans. We would appreciate your participation. Your responses will be confidential and will not be identified with your school or district. Survey respondents will receive a copy of the survey report in the summer of 2000.

CSR Reform Model(s) You Are Currently Implementing in Your Classroom:
1.
2.
3.

In column A below, please circle a number to indicate the extent to which each area was a focus of reform efforts this school year (1999–2000).
In column B, please rate the amount of progress you feel your school has made in each area of focus. *If the area was not a focus, leave column B blank.*

Reform Component	**A** **Extent to Which This is a Focus of CSR Efforts in 1999-2000** 3–A primary focus 2–A secondary focus 1–Not yet a focus 0–Past focus—goal previously addressed	**B** **Rating of Progress in Areas of Major or Minor Focus** 5–Goals achieved 4–Significant progress made 3–Some progress made 2–A little progress made 1–No progress made
1. Ensuring that our comprehensive reform plans cover curriculum, instruction, assessment, parent involvement, professional development, and school management, and that these elements are appropriately aligned.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
2. Obtaining support from the entire staff in implementing the reform models.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
3. Establishing measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement that are aligned with state standards.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
4. Involving parents in school reform planning, training, or implementation activities.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1

Reform Component	A Extent to Which This is a Focus of CSR Efforts in 1999–2000 3–A primary focus 2–A secondary focus 1–Not yet a focus 0–Past focus—goal previously addressed	B Rating of Progress in Areas of Major or Minor Focus 5–Goals achieved 4–Significant progress made 3–Some progress made 2–A little progress made 1–No progress made
5. Using effective, research-based methods and strategies for:		
a. Improving curriculum.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
b. Improving instructional strategies.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
c. Improving the integration of technology into instruction.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
d. Improving school organization or management.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
e. Improving the assessment of student progress.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
6. Providing professional development for teachers to help implement reform strategies.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
7. Obtaining additional technical assistance from external sources to implement CSR strategies.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
8. Using data to evaluate the implementation and outcomes of CSR efforts.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
9. Obtaining support from the district office to implement reform strategies.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
10. Ensuring that the CSR-funded reform effort is coordinated with our school's other reform efforts.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
11. Coordinating financial resources for CSR with other resources to support reform.	3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1

1. What have been the greatest successes in your CSR efforts to date?

Thank you for your assistance!
Please mail your completed survey to
Larry Friedman, NCREL, 1900 Spring Road, Oak Brook, IL 60521

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
X	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").